

Message

---

**From:** LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]  
**Sent:** 9/28/2018 11:26:35 PM  
**To:** Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]; Bill Franklin (william.d.franklin@navy.mil) [william.d.franklin@navy.mil]  
**CC:** Calvino, Maria Soledad [Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]; Lane, Jackie [Lane.Jackie@epa.gov]; Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Yogi, David [Yogi.David@epa.gov]; Koenig, Kellie/SDO [Kellie.Koenig@jacobs.com]; Elizabeth Basinet [elizabeth.basinete@NOREASINC.COM]; Henderson, Kim/SDO [Kimberly.Henderson@jacobs.com]; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; tina.low@waterboards.ca.gov; Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-EMB) [sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov]; Wright, Matthew@CDPH [matthew.wright@cdph.ca.gov]; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) [amy.brownell@sfdph.org]  
**Subject:** EPA Comments on draft script for video - RE: EPA logo permission FW: Navy video--Hunters Point Parcel G Work Plan

Dear Bill and Derek,

Thank you for sending the draft video script. We have no concerns about using the EPA logo if it is intended to accompany this language: "To monitor proper data collection, the Navy has hired an on-site, quality assurance contractor to oversee the field work and to verify procedures are followed. The U.S. EPA and the California Department of Public Health will also conduct independent sampling to substantiate findings." This is indeed our plan, in our regulatory oversight role, and it is important to explain this plan to the public.

However, I have also reviewed the rest of the script. This script gives a vague description of recent events that could be interpreted by the public as an attempt to downplay the significance of problems found. Similarly Navy drafts of the Parcel G retesting Workplan and the Five Year Review (and many fact sheets) did not convey the whole picture. EPA has made written comments on these documents to recommend that the Navy add more crucial details, e.g. directly reference confirmed falsification by Tetra Tech EC Inc.

In addition, I have made both written and verbal recommendations in the past that the Navy should not use language like this:

"The city has plans for future redevelopment that will bring environmental, social, and economic benefits to the community."

Any determination regarding future plans and potential benefits or costs to the community is not the role of the Navy or the regulators. That is the City government's role. Once others determine the intended future use, then it is our role to ensure that the property is cleaned up in a manner that makes it suitable for that use. It is inappropriate for the Navy to make any judgments regarding community benefits. Statements like this could be interpreted by the public as endorsement of a particular future use when the Navy and regulators should be neutral on this topic.

- Lily